

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/049,821	02/19/2002	Yasuyuki Suzuki	2002-0206A	2849
513 7	7590 02/26/2004		EXAMINER	
WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P.			PRYOR, ALTON NATHANIEL	
2033 K STREET N. W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1021			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1616	
			DATE MAILED: 02/26/2004	1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

,						
*	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/049,821	SUZUKI ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Alton N. Pryor	1616				
The MAILING DATE of this commu Period for Reply	unication appears on the cover shee	t with the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMU - Extensions of time may be available under the provision after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this col - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	NICATION. Ins of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, ma mmunication. (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) I ply will, by statute, cause the application to become after the mailing date of this communication, even	ny a reply be timely filed f thirty (30) days will be considered timely. MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. The ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) f	iled on <i>08 December 200</i> 3.					
2a)☐ This action is FINAL .	<u>_</u>					
3) Since this application is in condition						
closed in accordance with the practice	ctice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 (C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the	e application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>7-10,13</u> ,	4a) Of the above claim(s) 7-10,13,14 and 18-33 is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) <u>1-6,11,12,15,16 and 34-4</u>	<u>10</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) <u>17</u> is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to rest	riction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by	the Examiner.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/ar	re: a)□ accepted or b)□ objected	to by the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any ob	jection to the drawing(s) be held in abe	eyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) includi	ng the correction is required if the draw	ving(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected	to by the Examiner. Note the attac	ched Office Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a clair	m for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C	C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
a) ☑ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
	ty documents have been received.					
<u> </u>	ty documents have been received i	n Application No				
<u> </u>	s of the priority documents have be					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	tional Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	5011 10001101 III III III II III III III				
* See the attached detailed Office act	` ' ' '	not received.				
	·					
Attachment/c)						
Attachment(s) 1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	A) Intervie	ew Summary (PTO-413)				
Notice of References Cited (FTO-092) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review	(PTO-948) Paper	No(s)/Mail Date				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449	si i i si	of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) L Other:	·				

Art Unit: 1616

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

I. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for treating melatonin related diseases, does not reasonably provide enablement for preventing said diseases. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make / use the invention commensurate in scope with the claim. The asserted utility is not believable on its face. It is not known how a method wherein a composition is claimed can be administered to prevent said diseases. The state of the art is what prior art knows about the invention. There is no known art wherein a certain composition is administered to successfully prevent melatonin related diseases. The level of ordinary skill in the art is high but only in the art of treating / controlling said diseases. The predictability or lack thereof in the art refers to the ability of one skilled in the art to extrapolate the disclosed or known results to the claimed invention. The lower the predictability, the higher the direction and guidance that must be provided by the applicant. In the instant invention the predictability is very low and consequently, the

Art Unit: 1616

need for the higher levels of direction and guidance by the applicant. However, the amount of direction and guidance provided by the applicant is limited to treatment. There is no evidence in the specification that established correlation between the experiment and the claimed utility. The quantity of experimentation required to use the method as claimed in the instant invention, based on applicant's disclosure would be undue because, one of ordinary skill in the art would have performed significant amount of experiments.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 39 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 39 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps are: To what object is the preparation being administered to?

Claim Objection under 37 CFR

Claim 34 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 34 does not add a limitation to the preparation (composition) claimed in claim 1.

Art Unit: 1616

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-6,11,12,15,34-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ohkawa (US 6034239: 3/7/00). Ohkawa teaches a composition for treating sleep disorders comprising the elected melatonin receptor agonist compound, (S)-N-[2-(1,6,7,8-tetrahydro-2H-indeno[5,4-b]furan-8-yl)ethyl]propionamide, plus propylene glycol (polyhydric alcohol) or glycerin monostearate (fatty acid ester). See abstract, column 103 line 15 – column 105 line 35. Instant claims 35-38 are inherent properties of the said melatonin once taken by a patient.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1616

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Ohkawa as applied to claims 1-6,11,12,15,34-40 above in further view of Gilula et al

(US 6271015; 8/7/01). See 35 USC 102(e) rejection above. Ohkawa teaches all that is
recited in claims 16 and 17 except for the composition or preparation comprising a fatty
acid amide. However, Gilula teaches a composition for treating sleeping disorders
comprising 9,10-octadecenoamide (fatty acid amide). See abstract, column 10 line –
column 11 line 32. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to
modify the invention taught by Ohkawa to include the fatty acid amide taught by Gilula.
One would have been motivated to do this since both prior art inventions individually
teach preparations or compositions for treating sleep disorders.

Claim Objection / Election Status

Claim 17 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The elected composition comprising (S)-N-[2-(1,6,7,8-tetrahydro-2H-indeno[5,4-b]furan-8-yl)ethyl]propionamide plus lauric diethanolamide is not taught or suggested by the prior art.

Telephonic Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alton N. Pryor whose telephone number is 571-272-0621. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..

Art Unit: 1616

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman Page can be reached on 571-272-0602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ALTON N. PRYOR
Alton PRIMARY EXAMINER

Primary Examiner

AU 1616